



**From the Ethics of Domination to the Ethics of Responsibility: Towards
Reestablishing the Relationship Between Humanity and Nature in
Contemporary Environmental Philosophy**



Dr. Amel Meddahi

Amel.meddahi@univ-tiaret.dz

IBN Khaldoun University of Tiaret, Algeria

ORCID iD: 0009000625590491

Received: 24/06/2026 ; Accepted: 26/08/2026 , Published: 15/10/2026

Abstract:

In this article, we seek to address the problematic transition from the ethics of domination to the ethics of responsibility within contemporary environmental philosophy. This is approached by questioning the philosophical and ethical foundations upon which anthropocentrism has rested, which in turn contributed to entrenching a relationship based on control and exploitation in humanity's dealings with nature. Grounded in the current environmental crisis which expresses a deeper crisis in philosophical perceptions that reduced nature to its utilitarian dimension while ignoring its intrinsic value as well as its existential and ethical dimensions we aim to analyze Hans Jonas's contributions to establishing an ethics of responsibility based on the protection of life and consideration for the rights of future generations. Alongside this, we examine Arne Næss's conception of deep ecology, which calls for transcending anthropocentrism and rethinking humanity's place within the ecological system.

Keywords: Environmental Philosophy, Ethics of Domination, Ethics of Responsibility, Anthropocentrism, Hans Jonas, Arne Næss, Deep Ecology, Environmental Crisis.

Introduction

Since the beginnings of philosophical thought, the relationship between humanity and nature has occupied a central position in the inquiries concerning existence and the human placement in the world. Nature is no longer merely a framework that shelters human existence, rather, it has become an object of contemplation, knowledge, and interpretation, causing this relationship to assume diverse existential, cognitive, and ethical dimensions. With the transformations witnessed by modern thought notably scientific and technological development and the growing human capacity to exploit natural resources this relationship gradually shifted from interaction and adaptation to escalating patterns of control and exploitation.

This transformation has generated a cluster of questions regarding the limits of human authority over nature, the justifications for its exploitation, and whether moral value is strictly confined to humans or extends to living beings and the natural world. Amidst the escalation of contemporary environmental crises, rethinking this relationship is no longer a purely technical matter, rather, it has

become a philosophical and ethical necessity that touches upon the principles and values framing humanity's relationship with its natural environment.

In this context, the relationship between humanity and nature reveals a deep intertwining of existence, knowledge, and value. It is not merely defined by a shared natural belonging, but is instead grounded in philosophical conceptions that determine humanity's status in existence, the nature of its relationship with its environment, and the boundaries of its responsibility toward it. Under the dominance of instrumental rationality and the rise of techno centrism, modern philosophical thought has helped consolidate an anthropocentric view that turned nature into an object of knowledge and control, and reason into an instrument to subjugate the world according to the dictates of utility and progress.

However, the compounding of contemporary ecological crises has exposed the limitations of this perspective, highlighting the contradiction between humanity's drive to dominate nature and the reality of its existential belonging to it and reliance upon it. Consequently, the environmental crisis is no longer merely an imbalance in the natural equilibrium, it has come to express a philosophical and ethical crisis that calls for a reassessment of the foundations governing the relationship between humanity and the natural world, moving beyond the utilitarian paradigm that reduces the value of entities to their usefulness for humans.

Against this backdrop, contemporary environmental philosophy emerges as a critical horizon seeking to deconstruct anthropocentrism and reestablish the relationship with nature on new ethical grounds. This endeavor is clearly manifested in the philosophy of Hans Jonas, who reconstructed the concept of responsibility in light of the growing power of technology and its extended future impacts, and in the project of Arne Næss, who through deep ecology called for transcending anthropocentrism and recognizing the intrinsic value of living beings and nature. Despite the differences in their starting points, both perspectives open a space for discussing and questioning the logic of domination and control, searching for the possibility of building a more balanced and comprehensive relationship between humanity and nature.

From this standpoint, the problematic of the study is defined by the following question:

To what extent has contemporary environmental philosophy been able to transcend the human centered paradigm rooted in the domination of nature and establish a new ethic based on responsibility and the recognition of the intrinsic value of living beings and nature?

The following subsidiary questions branch out from this core problem:

- What are the philosophical foundations that contributed to entrenching anthropocentrism and the logic of dominating nature?
- How did Hans Jonas contribute to reestablishing moral responsibility in the face of contemporary environmental and technological challenges?
- How is the questioning of anthropocentrism manifested in the philosophy of Arne Næss and deep ecology?

- To what extent does the shift toward the ethics of responsibility represent a transcendence of traditional moral frameworks, or a reconstruction of them in light of new environmental challenges?

To address this problem, we have adopted a critical analytical methodology. This aims to uncover the theoretical foundations underlying their perspectives, analyze the limits of their contributions to rethinking the human nature relationship, and illuminate the possibility of establishing an ethical horizon that surpasses the logic of domination while responding to contemporary ecological transformations and challenges.

1. The Environmental Crisis as an Ethical and Philosophical Crisis

The environmental crisis presents itself as one of the most significant issues and problemisms exposing the impasse of modern civilization. Humanity no longer faces nature merely as an external environment for its existence, but rather confronts the consequences of its own civilization operating within it. The development that granted humanity an unprecedented capacity to reshape the world has simultaneously led to outcomes that place the continuation of life under threat in various types and forms. Thus, the environmental problem transcends the boundaries of pollution, resource depletion, and the disruption of natural balances, it transforms into a problem concerning humanity in its very essence, the limits of its freedom, the meaning of progress, and the responsibility entailed by holding the power to influence the destiny of living beings.

On this basis, nature is no longer understood philosophically as a mere object of human action, but rather as a partner in an existential and ethical relationship that demands a reevaluation of the model which made humanity the center of value. Today's environmental crisis reveals that human destiny is inseparable from the destiny of nature, and that any assault on the conditions of life ultimately rebounds upon humanity itself. Consequently, contemporary philosophical thought has opened up to questioning the foundations upon which the traditional relationship between humanity and nature was built, in search of new ethical horizons that make responsibility, limits, coexistence, and the preservation of life the guiding principles for reconstructing this relationship.

The environmental crisis has not been confined to its ethical dimension alone, it extends deeply into the philosophical realm. Fundamental problems concerning humanity's place in the cosmos, the nature of its relationship with nature, the meaning of progress and civilization, and the limits of instrumental reason which turned scientific and technological knowledge into a means to control the natural world have all been brought back to the table. As Taha Abdurrahman observes, continuous and multiplying technological inventions have generated fluctuations in the affairs of life and transformations in societal matters whose magnitude cannot be easily imagined (Abdurrahman, 2000, p. 124).

Progress, which was once viewed as an indicator of societal development and human wellbeing, has begun to provoke critical questions regarding its environmental and human costs, especially when it turns into a goal rooted in unlimited economic growth and excessive consumption. The environmental crisis has shown that humanity's capacity to control nature does not necessarily mean it possesses sufficient wisdom to guide that control, and that subjecting the natural world to the logic of production and profit can lead to outcomes that threaten the very conditions necessary for life to continue.

Accordingly, addressing the environmental crisis cannot be limited to technical solutions, legal measures, and economic policies vital though they are. It also requires a profound review of the intellectual and normative frames that guide humanity's relationship with nature. What is required is not merely curbing pollution or rationalizing resource consumption, but rather reconstructing human consciousness upon new ethical and philosophical foundations that acknowledge the limits of human power, affirm the importance of responsibility toward living organisms and natural systems, and link the concept of progress to the requirements of sustainability and respect for life. Hence, overcoming the environmental crisis necessitates moving away from the logic of domination and exploitation toward a logic of participation and balance, and shifting from a narrow utilitarian outlook to a broader ethical conception that recognizes the intrinsic value of nature.

Consequently, it can be said that the environmental crisis represents both an ethical and a philosophical crisis simultaneously. It is ethical because it reveals a distortion in the system of values and responsibilities governing human behavior toward the natural world, and it is philosophical because it calls into question traditional conceptions regarding human standing, the meaning of progress, and the limits of our relationship with nature. Thus, the environment transforms from a mere subject of scientific research and technical management into a central philosophical issue that demands a reconsideration of the meaning of human existence and the foundations upon which relations between humanity and all living beings should rest thereby ensuring the continuity of life and preserving ecological balance for present and future generations.

2. The Ethics of Responsibility in Hans Jonas

The ethics of responsibility in Hans Jonas represents a philosophical attempt to reconstruct morality in light of the transformations brought about by scientific and technological progress, especially after human capacity to impact nature and life transcended the boundaries of traditional action and its immediate effects. Jonas argues that the expansion of this power necessitates a broadening of the concept of responsibility, ensuring it is no longer restricted to contemporary humans and interpersonal relations, but extends to nature and future generations. From here, Jonas founds an ethics oriented toward protecting the continuity of life and safeguarding the conditions of its existence, urging humanity to anticipate the distant consequences of its actions before undertaking them, and making responsibility a foundational principle in guiding its relationship with nature and technology.

His philosophy calls for transcending traditional moral principles and formulating a new vision to frame human action. In this context, Jonas points out that technological achievements long associated with promises of welfare and progress now carry risks that threaten ecological balance and the continuity of human existence. This makes it imperative to subject technological development to the demands of moral responsibility to ensure the protection of nature and the safeguarding of the future of life. As he notes: *"Technology constitutes a real threat or danger to the environment and to man himself."* (Jonas, 1995, p. 13)

If the transformations wrought by modern technology in the human nature relationship constitute a risk and a threat, it is necessary to rethink the concept of moral responsibility so that it is no longer confined to the present, but extends into the future and to the destiny of nature itself. On this, Jonas states: *"The future of humanity is the primary obligation of collective human conduct in the era of technological civilization... and certainly the future of nature must not be understood as separate from*

us, it is a metaphysical responsibility performed for its own sake, for man has come to constitute a danger to his vital milieu.” (Jonas, 1995, p. 15)

This clarifies the standing of moral responsibility in the technological age. The future of humanity is no longer a matter confined solely to the present, it has become a collective, shared obligation that extends toward future generations and toward nature as an essential precondition for human existence and persistence. Once humanity, thanks to science and technology, acquired an unprecedented capacity to control and alter nature, it shifted from being a mere creature influenced by its surroundings to a force capable of threatening the vital milieu itself. Consequently, it is no longer legitimate to view nature as a mere resource to serve human ends.

The statement that *"the future of nature must not be understood as separate from us"* reveals the unity of destiny between humanity and the natural world, threatening nature is, at its core, threatening human existence itself. Therefore, responsibility toward nature becomes a moral duty that transcends direct utility and the immediate present, encompassing the maintenance of life's conditions and the preservation of the possibility of tomorrow's human being. Thus, morality transforms from an ethics focused on the immediate results of actions into an ethics that anticipates the future, obligating humanity to act in ways that guarantee the survival and continuity of life.

Jonas observes: *"The inevitable utopian expansion of modern technology leads to a continuous narrowing of the useful distance between everyday purposes and ultimate goals, between the opportunities for exercising ordinary intelligence and those for exercising enlightened wisdom... given that we live today permanently under the shadow of an unwanted, automatic utopianism, which is part of the fact that it projects its effects onto nature."* (Hans Jonas, 1992, p. 44)

Here, we see Jonas's critique of the escalating expansion of modern technology as a force no longer restricted to meeting daily needs, but extending to defining ultimate human aims and reshaping humanity's relationship with nature. Technological development, in his view, results in a compression of the distance between action and consequence, and between practical intelligence which allows humans to expand their control and enlightened wisdom, which enables them to gauge the ethical and distant ramifications of that control.

Consequently, humanity finds itself living within what Jonas calls "an unwanted automatic utopianism," where technological progress continues almost autonomously, unaccompanied by the moral consciousness necessary to constrain and direct it. The danger of this situation lies in the fact that technology's effects are no longer confined to the human sphere, they have spilled over into nature and begun to threaten the very conditions of life. Therefore, Jonas calls for restoring the role of wisdom and moral responsibility in guiding technological power, so that not everything technologically possible is deemed morally permissible, rather, actions must be subjected to an ethical scale that anticipates the future of humanity and nature, as well as the rights of future generations.

"This oppressive tribute paid to human repressive power speaks of its violent eruption and the generation of violence within the cosmic order, the daring invasion of various natural domains by tireless intelligence." (Hans Jonas, 1992, p. 19)

Here, Jonas indicates that the maximization of human power can turn into a repressive force when humanity exceeds the limits of nature and seeks to subject it to its own logic and goals. The "daring

invasion of natural domains" expresses humanity's transition from merely interacting with nature to deeply intervening in its systems and disrupting its balances, relying on a technical intelligence that tirelessly innovates new means of control and modification.

Yet, this power is fraught with grave consequences because it can generate new forms of violence within the natural order, turning human regulatory capability into a source of environmental disorder and a threat to the conditions of life. Hence, Jonas critiques the illusion of absolute human mastery, emphasizing that the expansion of technological power must be matched by a corresponding expansion in moral awareness and responsibility. Because humanity has become capable of affecting nature on such a massive scale, it has likewise become responsible for protecting its balance and future.

2.1 The Principle of Responsibility and Human Responsibility for the Future

Nature is no longer merely an object through which the human will to dominate and control is manifested, nor is it a mere field for exploitation, it has become an ethical horizon from which human responsibility toward all living existence emerges. The relationship between humanity and nature is no longer reducible to the logic of utility and ownership, rather, it demands a rethinking of its philosophical foundations by shifting from an ethics of control to an ethics of responsibility. Following Hans Jonas's vision, protecting life and ensuring the continuity of existence become fundamental preconditions for human action, and a moral imperative extending beyond the present to embrace the future of humanity and nature alike.

The principle of responsibility, whose importance Hans Jonas emphasized (in *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*, 1979), ought to represent the pivot around which practices must revolve in all spheres of new life, and within the code of ethical conduct to be followed and respected (Collective Authors, 2018, p. 49).

In *The Imperative of Responsibility*, Jonas considers that the scientific mindset's excess of artificiality, devoid of a sense of responsibility, has instilled a deep fear of the future in the human heart. This fear stems from uncertainty regarding how nature will react to restore its natural balance through its own processes, having suffered disruptions caused by human technologies, waste, and excessive political economic exploitation (Mourad Diani, 2022, p. 431).

The principle of responsibility appears as the very spirit of post moral culture. If the calls of responsibility cannot be divorced from presenting the idea of moral obligation, their distinctive feature is that they will nowhere call for self-sacrifice on the altar of lofty ideals: our theoretical ethics of responsibility is a reasonable theoretical ethics untroubled by reconciliatory strain (Jacqueline Russ, 2001, p. 41).

This implies that the concept of moral responsibility has undergone a transformation. Responsibility is no longer based on self-sacrifice for the sake of elevated ideals or absolute values, instead, it has become bound to the spirit of a post moral culture characterized by rationality and realism. The principle of responsibility, in this context, reflects a new moral consciousness that starts from an awareness of human limits and capacities, moving away from traditional moral paradigms that imposed idealistic obligations exceeding human capability.

Consequently, responsibility no longer means self-denial or submission to absolute duties, but is instead based on a rational appraisal of duties that balances the demands of morality with the conditions of reality. Thus, ethics shifts from a logic of sacrifice and idealism to a logic of reasonable responsibility, where moral action becomes linked with wisdom, foresight, and the capacity to make balanced decisions without abandoning moral commitment.

Moral responsibility manifests as a commitment transcending the boundaries of the present to include the care and continuity of human existence. Moral duty is not confined to meeting immediate needs, it extends to safeguarding the future of the other and securing the conditions for their growth and persistence. From this standpoint, parental responsibility has emerged as a new ethical model embodying the highest forms of commitment toward the other, owing to the continuous care and future oriented outlook it entails.

Parental responsibility relates to the child in terms of their comprehensive existence, not merely through their immediate needs, it is a responsibility that cannot take a holiday: it is continuous because the subject's life, which continues uninterrupted, continually generates its own immediate demands for the other, and finally, responsibility addresses the future of the child's existence (Jacqueline Russ, 2001, p. 84).

Jonas sees parental responsibility as a model for moral responsibility because it is not restricted to fulfilling a child's present needs, but extends to ensuring the continuity of their existence and protecting their future. This responsibility is a permanent, renewed obligation deriving its legitimacy from the fragility of human life and the necessity of preserving it. He also touches upon political responsibility: the responsibility of the statesman is likewise exemplary and raises questions concerning the life of the community. Even if motivated by a taste for power, the politician looks toward a collective, strives to safeguard an identity across time, and ultimately aims at an object that has a future and a coming human existence (Jacqueline Russ, 2001, p. 84).

Through these examples, Jonas sketches out the model of contemporary responsibility: it addresses the furthest future of humanity, extends to posterity far removed from us, and finally, as we have seen, it is free of reciprocity, ultimately pointing to a task in an unlimited future where responsibility undertakes to care for vulnerable, mortal humanity and life. As long as existence is infinitely better than nonexistence, it is our duty to safeguard this humanity within existence itself (Jacqueline Russ, 2001, p. 84).

These examples clarify that moral responsibility is no longer limited to the present or to direct relations among individuals, it has become an obligation stretching toward the future of humanity and future generations even those not yet born. This responsibility is not founded on the principle of reciprocity or the expectation of reward, but stems from an absolute moral duty obligating humanity to protect fragile human life and ensure its persistence.

This is what Jonas emphasizes: human existence carries intrinsic value that renders it worthy of protection, and the superiority of existence over nothingness imposes upon humanity the duty to maintain the conditions for life's continuity, especially under the shadow of technological progress and its attendant threats to humanity's future. According to Hans Jonas's philosophy, several types or dimensions of moral responsibility can be deduced from his conception of contemporary responsibility:

- **Parental Responsibility:** Consists of nurturing the child and protecting their comprehensive existence, extending beyond immediate needs to secure their future and development.
- **Political Responsibility:** Relates to managing community affairs and protecting the lives of its members, while accounting for the future impacts of political decisions and ensuring the continuity of human life.
- **Responsibility Toward Future Generations:** Concerns the moral commitment to safeguard the future of humanity including generations yet unborn and guarantee their right to live under conditions of a dignified human existence.
- **Responsibility Toward Nature and the Environment:** Based on protecting living organisms and the natural milieu from the hazards of excessive technological intervention, rooted in the recognition of life's value and the necessity of maintaining ecological balance.
- **Technological and Scientific Responsibility:** Consists of guiding scientific and technological progress ethically, anticipating potential risks, and curbing their destructive impacts on humanity and nature.

From the foregoing, it is clear that Jonas's principle of responsibility marks a turning point in contemporary moral thought. Morality is no longer restricted to regulating human relations in the present, rather, it is summoned to anticipate the future and bear the consequences of human action particularly in light of technological development and the hazards it poses to humanity and nature.

From this standpoint, Jonas establishes a new ethic grounded in the commitment to protect life, safeguard human existence, and ensure its continuity for future generations, considering that responsibility is not confined to meeting immediate needs, but extends to all that guarantees the survival and potential continuation of life. Thus, responsibility becomes a moral duty transcending self-interest and immediate gain, affirming that human power and capability to change the world impose an ethical obligation proportional to the magnitude of human impact making the preservation of humanity and nature's future the foundation of every moral action.

3. Arne Næss and Deep Ecology

Environmental thought has undergone profound, fundamental transformations capable of shifting its trajectory from a mere preoccupation with protecting nature to questioning the intellectual and ethical foundations governing humanity's relationship with it. Ecology thereby transcended the limits of philosophical theorization to impact reality and praxis. These transformations contributed to the emergence of contemporary philosophical trends that sought to rethink the human nature relationship and move beyond traditional paradigms placing humanity at the axis of existence and the center of value.

Within this context, deep ecology emerged among contemporary philosophical trends as a critical vision seeking to transcend the traditional view that makes humanity the axis of nature and the center of value. It departed from a foundational principle: acknowledging the intrinsic value of living organisms and ecological systems, independently of their utility to humans. Arne Næss thus affirmed that all life forms possess an inherent right to exist and flourish. He also called for rebuilding the

human nature relationship on the basis of interconnectedness and integration, rather than domination and exploitation.

With the intensification of environmental hazards resulting from human interventions, critical writings emerged revealing the depth of the crisis threatening natural balance. Prominent among them was the work of American writer Rachel Carson in her book *Silent Spring*, where she shed light on the devastating effects of chemical pesticides on living organisms, causing massive mortality among birds and animals. Consequently, spring supposed to teem with the sounds of nature and bird songs grew silent due to human practices.

This contribution served as an important entry point for deepening awareness of environmental problems and paved the way for the evolution of philosophical visions moving beyond mere calls to protect nature toward questioning the intellectual and ethical foundations governing humanity's relationship with it. In this framework, Carson's environmental critique converges with the philosophical orientation adopted by Arne Næss in deep ecology, in terms of rejecting the reduction of nature to its utilitarian value and calling for the recognition of the intrinsic value of all living beings.

Næss announced the inception of deep ecology internationally with the publication of *Silent Spring*: *"We begin by proclaiming the deep ecology movement internationally starting from the publication of Silent Spring."* (Arne Naess, 2005, p. 191)

In this framework, deep ecology emerges as a philosophical and ethical orientation seeking to rebuild the human nature relationship by transcending traditional conceptions that make humanity the axis of existence and center of value. It proceeds from a fundamental principle: nature possesses an intrinsic value independent of human interests, and all living creatures deserve respect regardless of their utility to humans.

From this standpoint, deep ecology calls for a radical transformation in human perception of the natural world, demanding the abandonment of exploitative tendencies and the adoption of an ecological consciousness grounded in respect for the interconnectedness among various life forms. This paves the way for understanding nature as an integrated system whose elements cannot be separated from one another.

"Deep ecology sees the natural world as a complex and delicate balance of relationships among living organisms that depend on each other within ecosystems. It is improper for humanity to pose any threat to this system through its intervention not only toward other creatures, but also humanity must not pose a threat to itself and its own existence in this environment." (Mostafa AlNashar, 2017, p. 88)

We must not minimize the uniqueness of human beings, paleontology tells us about the extinction of millions of species, but the thinking being is biologically unique due to possessing reason, and materially unique due to using thousands of means and tools (Arne Naess, 2005, p. 169).

This affirms human uniqueness and distinction from other living creatures. Humans are uniquely endowed with reason, enabling them to think, become conscious, and create, alongside their capacity to invent means and tools that allow them to control nature and alter their environment. Paleontology, through studying the extinction of millions of species throughout history, reveals the fragility of biological existence and the importance of preserving biodiversity.

This perspective can be linked to the philosophy of Hans Jonas, particularly the principle of responsibility, which makes human mental and technological superiority the basis of an ethical obligation toward nature and the future of life. Possessing reason and technological capability does not grant humans the right to exercise absolute control over other creatures, rather, it burdens them with the responsibility of protecting ecological balance and avoiding actions that threaten the continuity of life.

Hence, the reality of human uniqueness lies not only in possessing knowledge and making tools, but also manifests in the capacity to employ them in accordance with a responsible ethical consciousness ensuring coexistence between humanity and nature while preserving the rights of future generations.

“Human beings alone on this planet formulate ethical standards about equal rights.” (Arne Naess, 2005, p. 186)

Since humans are distinguished from other creatures as beings capable of rational thought and the formulation of ethical standards governing relations with others including the principle of equal rights rooted in recognizing human dignity and rejecting discrimination among individuals this idea connects closely with Hans Jonas’s philosophy, especially the principle of responsibility. Jonas broadens the scope of moral obligation to encompass not only relations among humans, but also nature, living creatures, and the future of upcoming generations.

If humans are distinguished from other creatures by their capacity to establish moral rules, this distinction should not transform into a vehicle for domination, rather, it should serve as a foundation for bearing responsibility for the consequences of one's actions. Thus, the formulation of equal rights standards reveals humanity's capacity to transcend individual interests toward building a moral system grounded in justice and respect. However, in Jonas's view, moral responsibility extends beyond human equality to include the protection of the conditions necessary for life to continue on Earth.

“Man cannot kill other beings because his value is greater than theirs.” (Arne Naess, 2005, p. 168)

Human mental or biological superiority does not grant absolute license to kill other beings or inflict harm upon them a point emphasized by Hans Jonas, who asserts that human possession of reason and control over nature imposes a moral obligation to protect life and maintain the conditions for its continuity.

Despite their distinct mental and technological capabilities, humans are not isolated from the ecological system, rather, they form an integral part of it, and human actions affect its balance and the destiny of living creatures. From this standpoint, the value of other entities should not be measured by their usefulness to humans, instead, the fundamental importance of life and the necessity of respecting it must be acknowledged.

Accordingly, moral responsibility requires moving beyond the logic of domination and exploitation toward a relationship founded on respecting nature and protecting biodiversity, ensuring the continuity of life for present and future generations.

“All our basic values, lifestyles, our place in nature, our relationship with others, whether humans or nonhuman living beings.” (Arne Naess, 2005, p. 27)

This means that the core values embraced by humans, their lifestyles, their view of their place in nature, and their relationships with others whether human or nonhuman living beings are interconnected elements influencing human behavior and moral practices. Humans do not live in isolation from their environment, they belong to a natural system comprising diverse living creatures, which mandates a rethinking of the nature of their relationship with it.

In Hans Jonas's philosophy, this idea acquires special importance through the principle of responsibility, which calls for broadening the scope of ethics to encompass nonhuman entities and the natural environment, rather than restricting it to direct human interactions. Scientific and technological progress has altered human lifestyles and increased human capacity to impact nature, necessitating a revision of values and behaviors to guarantee the protection and continuity of life. Thus, the statement calls for building a comprehensive moral consciousness that makes humans more cognizant of their responsibility toward themselves, others, and nature, laying the groundwork for a relationship based on respect, balance, and sustainability.

"It is unwise to assume that improvement can be achieved without deep changes in economic systems, values must be promoted economically and socially." (Arne Naess, 1989, p. 24)

From the perspective of the ethics of responsibility, Arne Næss sees that true progress cannot be measured by material and technological development alone, it must be subjected to moral criteria respecting human dignity, the continuity of life, and the future of upcoming generations.

From this standpoint, assuming that societal improvement can be achieved without deep changes in economic structures remains a deficient conception. Moral values such as justice, solidarity, and responsibility should not remain merely theoretical principles, they must find effective application in economic practices and social relations.

This perspective opens up a philosophical problem concerning the limits of economic structures in shaping values, and the extent to which moral consciousness can direct social and economic change. Hence, the relationship between economics and ethics is interactive, reform is not limited to changing material conditions, but also requires building a responsible moral consciousness that guides this change toward protecting humanity and nature while securing the future of coming generations.

From what has preceded, it becomes clear through Arne Næss's contributions that overcoming the ecological crisis is not achieved merely by repairing the damage humans have inflicted upon nature, rather, it requires reconsidering the conception that led humans to place themselves outside and above the natural world. Deep ecology shifts environmental thinking from the logic of control and exploitation to the logic of belonging and interdependence, and from viewing nature as a tool to serve human needs to recognizing its intrinsic value and the right of creatures to exist.

Thus, ecological responsibility becomes a philosophical and ethical responsibility simultaneously, because it summons a transformation in human self-awareness and position within the web of life. From this perspective, protecting nature is not a defense of something separate from humans, but a defense of the very conditions that make life possible. Saving nature deeply presupposes that humans rediscover their limits and learn that existence is not fulfilled by dominating the world, but by living within it in a relationship marked by greater modesty, balance, and respect.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the problematic relationship between humanity and nature represents one of the central issues in contemporary environmental philosophy, especially amidst accelerated technical and scientific transformations and the resulting ecological imbalances threatening the conditions of life's continuation. An analysis of the philosophical foundations of this relationship shows that the traditional paradigm was largely built upon anthropocentrism, placing humans at the center while viewing nature as an external domain dedicated to meeting human needs and securing human interests. This conception was reinforced with the rise of instrumental rationality and technocentrism, leading nature to be understood increasingly through its amenability to measurement, investment, and control.

From this standpoint, the environmental crisis cannot be understood merely as a result of misusing natural resources, but rather as a crisis in the moral and philosophical perception of the relationship between humanity and nature. Traditional ethics focused on relations among humans, failing to grant nature and nonhuman creatures a clear moral standing. Consequently, moving beyond the ethics of domination requires expanding the moral domain to encompass life, nature, and unborn generations.

In this context, Hans Jonas's project represents an essential attempt to reconstruct morality in the face of the unprecedented power granted to humanity by modern technology. Jonas demonstrated that the expansion of technological capability led to an expansion in the scope of human action's consequences, rendering traditional ethics inadequate for dealing with the distant and extended effects of human deeds. Hence, the principle of responsibility emerged as the basis for a new morality accounting for the future and continuity of life. Responsibility in this view is not restricted to the immediate results of action, but extends to potential outcomes affecting humanity, nature, and future generations.

Furthermore, Jonas's ethics shifts responsibility from a limited individual sphere to a broader arena tied to the destiny of life itself. Armed with technological power, humanity is summoned to exercise caution and restraint in utilizing that capability, avoiding treating nature as an infinite, boundless field for intervention. Protecting and continuing life thus becomes an essential element of moral action.

As for Arne Næss, he took a different path through the project of deep ecology, which critiques anthropocentrism and calls for reconsidering human standing within the natural system. Næss's critique is not limited to demanding the protection of nature for human benefit, but moves toward recognizing that living beings and nature possess a value transcending direct human utility. Thus, the concept of the intrinsic value of nature emerges as a vital foundation for reconstructing environmental ethics.

Through the concepts of mutual dependence and ecological interdependence, deep ecology reveals that humans do not exist outside nature or in opposition to it, rather, they form part of a vast network of vital relationships. Consequently, harming nature should not be understood merely as damaging an economic resource or a human interest, but as a disruption within the web of life to which humans themselves belong. This perspective reshapes the human nature relationship on the basis of participation and integration rather than control and separation.

Comparing Jonas and Næss reveals that both share a critique of the view making humanity the absolute center and axis of the natural world, and both call for transcending the utilitarian outlook toward nature. However, their starting points differ: Jonas focuses primarily on responsibility for the

future of life and the necessity of curbing technological power, whereas Næss focuses on the intrinsic value of nature and a radical transformation in human vision regarding its place within the ecological system. Therefore, these two perspectives can be viewed as complementary pathways in reconstructing environmental ethics: one emphasizing human responsibility, and the other expanding moral recognition to encompass nature itself.

Accordingly, the transition from the ethics of domination to the ethics of responsibility does not mean eliminating the role of humans or denying their distinctiveness, rather, it redefines their position within the natural world in a way that renders them responsible for the consequences of their actions. What is required is not a shift from human centeredness to human exclusion, but a transcendence of absolute centrality toward a relational conception recognizing the interconnectedness of humanity and nature and the mutual dependence among various life forms.

Thus, the importance of contemporary environmental philosophy lies in its not merely diagnosing the symptoms of the environmental crisis, but posing a deeper problem regarding the foundations governing humanity's relationship with the natural world. Through Jonas and Næss, it becomes clear that confronting the crisis requires a transformation in moral consciousness itself: from exploitation to responsibility, from control to respect, from utility to the recognition of intrinsic value, and from preoccupation with the present alone to thinking about the future of life and upcoming generations.

In this way, reestablishing the relationship between humanity and nature can be considered an open philosophical and ethical project, requiring the combination of responsibility for the consequences of human action with the recognition of nature's intrinsic value. For the sustainability of life does not depend on scientific and technological development alone, it also demands a new ethical foundation that places limits on domination and makes the protection of nature a shared human destiny ..and making the preservation and continuity of life an essential, inherent part of human responsibility."

References

1. **Abderrahmane, T.** (2000). *The question of ethics: A contribution to the ethical critique of Western modernity* [Sual alakhlaq: Musahama fi alnaqd alakhlaqi lilhadatha algharbiya]. Le Centre Culturel Arabe.
2. **Jonas, H.** (1995). *Le principe responsabilité: Une éthique pour la civilisation technique* (J. Greisch, Trans.). Flammarion. (Original work published 1979).
3. **Jonas, H.** (1992). *Le principe de responsabilité* (J. Greisch, Trans.). Les Editions du Cerf.
4. **Russ, J.** (2001). *Contemporary ethics* [Alfikir alakhlaqi almu'asir] (A. ElAwa, Trans. & Ed., 1st ed.). Oweidat for Publishing and Printing.
5. **Diani, M.** (2022). *Research methodologies in social sciences and humanities (Vol. 1): Philosophical and epistemological approaches* [Manahij albahth fi alulum alijtima'iyya wa alinsaniyya, Aljuz' alawwal: Muqarabat falsafiyya wa ibistimulujiyya] (1st ed.). Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies.
6. **Naess, A.** (2005). The deep ecology of wisdom: Explorations in unities of nature and culture. In H. Glasser & A. Drengson (Eds.), *Selected works of Arne Naess* (Vol. X). Springer.

7. **Naess, A.** (1989). *Ecology, community and lifestyle: Outline of an ecosophy* (D. Rothenberg, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
8. **AlNashar, M.** (2017). *An introduction to environmental philosophy and contemporary philosophical schools* [Madkhal ila falsafat albi'a wa almadhahib alfalsafiyya almu'asira] (2nd ed.). AlDar AlMisriyah ALubnaniyah.